

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims for being anticipated by Cheng et al. (USP 6,542,943) and for being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Peterson et al. (US Pat. Appln: Pub. No. US 2004/0193515 A1).

In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to require a communicator at a base facility that integrates a plurality of databases, to thereby consolidate interactive information for use by a client. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at paragraphs [0019], [0021],[0022], and in Figs. 1 and 4. Claims 8-20 have been cancelled.

Amendments to the claims have been made to improve their readability, to more clearly define the structure and functionality of the present invention, and to point out the features which distinguish this invention over the cited references. Claims 1-7 remain pending.

Election/Restrictions

Non-elected claims 8-20 have been cancelled.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5 have been rejected for being anticipated by Cheng et al. (USP 6,542,943).

Independent claim 1 now requires several aspects that are neither taught nor suggested by Cheng et al. Specifically, these aspects are: 1) a communicator for integrating different databases; 2) the consolidation of interactive information from these different databases at the communicator; and 3) the collective use of this interactive information when performing a specified task. Applicant contends the present invention differs from the disclosure of Cheng et al. in all of these specific aspects. Further, Applicant contends this is so regardless whether the aspects are considered individually or collectively.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant contends the bases for rejecting claims for being anticipated by Cheng et al. have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected for being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Peterson et al. (US Pat. Appln: Pub. No. US 2004/0193515 A1).

The arguments presented above for distinguishing the present invention from the disclosure of Cheng et al. are incorporated here. With these arguments in mind, Applicant contends Peterson et al. do not provide any disclosure for the salient aspects of the present invention as enumerated above and now set forth in amended claim 1. Moreover, Peterson et al. have no motivation to do so.

Simply stated, none of the cited references teach or suggest a communicator that will integrate variously different databases, as now required by the present invention.

Further, none of the cited references consolidate interactive information from these different databases as now required by the present invention.


For the reasons stated above, Applicant contends the bases for rejecting claims for being unpatentable have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The references cited by the Examiner, but not relied on for the rejection of claims, have been noted.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-7 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at 619-688-1300 for any reason that would advance the instant application to issue.

Dated this 1st day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,


NEIL K. NYDEGGER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30,202
Customer No. 23862

NYDEGGER & ASSOCIATES
348 Olive Street
San Diego, California 92103
Telephone: (619) 688-1300